

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #: \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE FILED: 3/25/2022

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BRIAN K. WHITE,

Plaintiff,

-against-

DISTOKID; EUNICE LLOYD (also known as  
Eunice Rivers),

Defendants.

22-CV-2205 (VEC)

ORDER OF SERVICE

VALERIE CAPRONI, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff is appearing *pro se*. He brings this action under the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 *et seq.*, alleging that Defendants violated his rights. By order dated March 22, 2022, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP), that is, to waive the filing fees.

**DISCUSSION**

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, he is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)).

Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summons and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served summonses and the complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that summonses be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date summonses are issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*,

682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*, 378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) (“As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals’ failure to effect service automatically constitutes ‘good cause’ for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).”).

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendants DistroKid (sued herein as DistoKid), and Eunice Lloyd through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form (“USM-285 form”) for each of these defendants. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue summonses and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon Defendants.

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if his address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Clerk of Court is instructed to issue summonses for defendants, complete the USM-285 forms with the addresses for defendants, and deliver to the U.S. Marshals Service all documents necessary to effect service.

The Clerk of Court is further directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff, together with an information package.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 25, 2022  
New York, New York



---

VALERIE CAPRONI  
United States District Judge

**DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES**

1. DistroKid  
34 Third Avenue #183  
New York, NY 10003-5504
2. Eunice Lloyd  
94 Grant Avenue, Apt. 3R  
Jersey City, NJ 07305